



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/026,999 03/05/93 TSUTSUI

Y OPSCASE259

EXAMINER

SNYDER, R

B3M1/1103
FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL AND TANIS
2026 RAMBLING ROAD
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3

2313

DATE MAILED: 11/03/94

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims _____ are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. Claims _____ are allowed.
4. Claims _____ are rejected.
5. Claims _____ are objected to.
6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1835 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. Other

Art Unit: 2313

1. This Office Action is in response to application 08/026,999 filed March 5, 1993.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 2 at lines 17 and 19, the word "bit" should be changed to "bits".

On page 6 at lines 6-7, a word or phrase is missing after the word "skipped".

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The drawings are objected to because in Figure 1, Box 3, the word "maximum" is misspelled. Correction is required.

4. The Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because at line 2, a word or phrase is missing. Correction is required.

See M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same

Art Unit: 2313

person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Maruyama (US Patent 4,300,234) in view of Hart, Jr. (US Patent 3,751,649).

8. As to claim 1, Maruyama substantially teaches the claimed invention. Maruyama teaches an address pattern generator that is comprised of a column address generator and a row address generator and that these two address generating parts are identical in construction (Maruyama - col. 4, lines 16-19). Maruyama also teaches that the column and row address generators each receive an address from an initial value register and also an add signal to increment the value from the initial value register (col. 3, line 56 to col. 4, line 16). Maruyama further teaches that both the column and row address generators also each receive boundary values, which are equivalent to the claimed maximum values (col. 6, lines 23-30). Maruyama does not explicitly teach comparing the address to be supplied to memory with the boundary value. However, Hart teaches an address

Art Unit: 2313

pattern generating circuit in which the address to be supplied to the memory is compared to the highest memory address and that this comparison is sent to the control section which selects the appropriate output (Hart - col. 2, line 56 to col. 3, line 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Maruyama and Hart because both inventions deal with address pattern generating circuits. The modification would further have been obvious because Maruyama does include a maximum value register and logically the purpose of entering such data into the address pattern generator is to ensure that the output address does not exceed the maximum address value of the memory.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn Snyder whose telephone number is (703) 305-9688.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

65
gs

November 3, 1994


ROBERT W. BEAUSOLEIL, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2300